

REMARKS

Claims 26-45 remain pending in the present application. Claims 26 and 37 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Dexter for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview on July 18, 2006. At the interview, an agreement was not reached. At the interview, amended Claims 26 and 37 were presented. The Examiner indicated that the amendments would be considered upon further receipt of the amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 26, 30, 34, 35, 37, 42 and 44 as being anticipated by Holzer, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,103,565). The Examiner rejects Claims 26, 30, 34, 35, 37, 42 and 44 as being anticipated by Langhoff (U.S. Patent No. 5,306,025). The Examiner rejects Claims 26, 34-37, 44, and 45 as being anticipated by Wright (U.S. Patent No. 5,433,457). The Examiner rejects Claims 26, 27, 30-33 and 35 as being anticipated by Atkinson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,033,251). The Examiner rejects Claims 26-28 and 30 as being anticipated by Beale (U.S. Patent No. 3,977,287).

Claim 26 has been amended. Claim 26 has been amended to further define a first portion of the second edge immediately adjacent to the back edge substantially parallel to the back edge and laterally offset from the back edge such that the first portion is positioned inward of the back edge towards the shank first edge. The first portion defines a first angle. The step portion is formed between the first portion and the back edge. A second portion of the second edge extends inwardly from the first

portion and is angled with respect to the first portion to define an angularly disposed edge section proximate the rear mounting edge. The second edge portion extends substantially along the longitudinal axis and is disposed at an angle relative to the first portion toward the shank edge. The angularly disposed edge section generally defines a reciprocating axis of the saw blade.

As was discussed and pointed out at the interview, none of the references cited by the Examiner illustrate the saw blade as now claimed by Applicants. The references were discussed and the differences between Applicants' claimed saw blade was distinguished from each of the references. Accordingly, Applicants believe independent Claims 26 and 37, as well as their dependent Claims 26-36 and 38-45, to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claim 32 as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, obvious over Langhoff. Also, the Examiner has rejected Claims 27, 28, 39 and 40 as being unpatentable over Holzer, Jr. in view of Tseng (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,792). The Examiner has rejected Claims 27, 28, 39 and 40 as being unpatentable over Langhoff in view of Tseng. The Examiner has rejected Claims 27, 28, 29 and 40 as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Tseng. The Examiner has rejected Claims 28 and 29 as being unpatentable over Atkinson et al. in view of Tseng. The Examiner has rejected Claims 37-39, 42 and 43 as being unpatentable over Atkinson et al. in view of Holzer, Jr. Finally, the Examiner has rejected Claims 40 and 41 as being unpatentable over Atkinson et al. in view of Holzer, Jr. further in view of Tseng.

The addition of the Tseng reference in view of the previously cited primary references fails to overcome the deficiency of the primary references. Tseng neither discloses nor suggests the saw blade as claimed by Applicants. Thus, the combinations cited by the Examiner fail to disclose or suggest Applicants' invention. The combination of Atkinson et al. in view of Holzer, Jr. likewise fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' invention. The combination neither discloses nor suggests the claims as now amended.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the claims to be patentably distinct over the Examiner's combination.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,



W.R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,306
Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

Date: August 17, 2006
WRDT/lkj

Attorney Docket No. 0275S-000388